

From: ed cooley
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 4:29 PM
Subject: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation

Dear Commissioner:

Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Ed Cooley
PO Box 642
Elkton, OR 97436
541-584-2693

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: Patrik Rousselot
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 4:46 PM
Subject: Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Dear Chairman Michael Powell,

Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have totally failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq was more about propaganda to brain wash the populace where censorship was blatant than real information .

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Oppose media deregulation.

Sincerely,

Patrik Rousselot

From: athorpe@scetv.org
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 5:06 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Andrea Thorpe
1101 George Rogers Blvd.
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

cc:
Senator Lindsey Graham
Representative James Clyburn
Senator Ernest Hollings

From: estringer@lex.lib.sc.us
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 5:27 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Ellen Stringer
5440 Augusta Road
Lexington, South Carolina 29072

cc:
Senator Lindsey Graham
Representative Joe Wilson
Senator Ernest Hollings

From: CSeymour3@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 6:01 PM
Subject: Media Concentration: reply to public comments

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review
of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules
Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act
of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-
277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to reply to the public comments on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. To promote competition, diversity and local content, the FCC should retain the current media ownership rules and impose stricter public interest requirements.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding. I refer you to the comments made by Barry Diller on Bill Moyers program regarding the problems that he sees in moving in the direction that you are proposing. When even a person in his position sees the problems which could arise from further concentration of ownership, it should be clear to you that something is not right with your decision making.

The strength of this country comes from the freedom of the Press, freedom of religion, separation of powers, and the checks and balances which derive from our constitution. The conservation of our freedoms is especially important as we face threats to these uniquely American values from at home and abroad.

Thank you,

Charles Seymour

CC: bob_graham@graham.senate.gov

From: CSeymour3@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 6:01 PM
Subject: Media Concentration: reply to public comments

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review
of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules
Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act
of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-
277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to reply to the public comments on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. To promote competition, diversity and local content, the FCC should retain the current media ownership rules and impose stricter public interest requirements.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding. I refer you to the comments made by Barry Diller on Bill Moyers program regarding the problems that he sees in moving in the direction that you are proposing. When even a person in his position sees the problems which could arise from further concentration of ownership, it should be clear to you that something is not right with your decision making.

The strength of this country comes from the freedom of the Press, freedom of religion, separation of powers, and the checks and balances which derive from our constitution. The conservation of our freedoms is especially important as we face threats to these uniquely American values from at home and abroad.

Thank you,

Charles Seymour

CC: bob_graham@graham.senate.gov

From: louandbarbara1@netzero.net
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 6:37 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Barbara Cohen
9341 Collins Avenue
#1008
Surfside, Florida 33154-2662

cc:
Senator Bob Graham
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
Senator Bill Nelson

From: Vachelle McFarland
To: Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 7:05 PM
Subject: Media Deregulation Vote

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,
Vachelle McFarland
Los Angeles, CA

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: Vachelle McFarland
To: Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 7:05 PM
Subject: Media Deregulation Vote

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,
Vachelle McFarland
Los Angeles, CA

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: Melissa Pamer
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 7:18 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Melissa Pamer (pamer76@hotmail.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein,

Thank you so much for travelling to California to listen to the comments of those of us very concerned with media deregulation.

Especially because it may be, as you stated, "too late" to affect any sort of change on the proposed rule changes, your presence in San Francisco on Saturday is all the more meaningful. It practically brings tears to my eyes to know that there is someone like you at the FCC--someone who knows that these rules impact us, the public, and acknowledges that we care deeply about potential policy changes.

Chairman Powell's failure to recognize and/or care about the public's reaction to media deregulation is an incomprehensible outrage. As one speaker noted, Mr. Powell has said that media deregulation is good for business. "That," she said "is NOT the business of the FCC."

These are our airwaves, Mr. Adelstein. Thank you for fighting to protect our interest in them. Good luck.

Sincerely,
Melissa Pamer

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.43.60.50
Remote IP address: 12.43.60.50

From: surr@his.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 7:40 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

As a shareholder activist regarding GE/NBC, I have found oligopolistic management particularly difficult to work with when it comes to protecting America's children from lapses of corporate responsibility, and even from abuses of Federal law in the Children's Television Act.

Sincerely,

John Surr
8217 Lilly Stone Dr.
Bethesda, Maryland 20817-4505

cc:
Senator Paul Sarbanes
Senator Barbara Mikulski
Representative Chris Van Hollen

From: mhead15@rcn.com
To: john_mccain@mccain.senate.gov, fritz_hollings@hollings.senate.gov,
barbara_boxer@boxer.senate.gov, Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 7:54 PM
Subject: Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Dear Senators and Commissioners:

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Sincerely,
Marilyn F. Head
15 Belknap street
Somerville, MA 02144

From: Joseph Holder
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 8:31 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Joseph Holder (conquip@ix.netcom.com) writes:

I read Chairman Powell's remarks to the newspaper publisher's meeting on Findlaw. I was very disturbed by his "Orwellian speak".

I am amazed that a man in his position could state with a straight face that by creating the ability to purchase a monopoly the FCC will fight current monopolies.

The days of the "robber barons" of railroad fame are being replaced by the "robber barons" of the media. A perfect example is Clear Channel. They now own over 1200 stations in the United States, including all 5 of the largest stations in my home town.

With the Chairman's twisted logic they can now purchase the local paper, one or all three of the local stations that service my community, and that will create an anti-monopoly.

The dangers of such media monopolization was amply illustrated recently with the coordinated attack nationwide by the Clear Channel radio stations against the Dixie Chicks.

Somehow I am supposed to believe that giant media monopolies will not show a bias in their news or editorial stances in the future regarding political candidates, reporting and interviews, and all the other ways that the "manufacture of consent" can be accomplished.

All the commissioner's have a lawful mandate to represent the "public interest". If Powell doesn't know what that is, he needs to go back and read the Carnegie Study and Report, and recuse himself until he decides to represent the American people, not the media.

His actions and statements since becoming Chairman reflect a man totally out of sync with his oath of office and who his real clients are.

"Our" government is supposed to represent the interests and will of the people. Corporations are NOT people, nor are their interests the same.

The consolidation of the sources of information by mega-corporations is dangerous, anti-competitive, monopolistic, and will result in a loss to our freedoms and democracy.

I ask for your strong opposition to this major miscarriage of the FCC's mandate.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 68.185.68.119
Remote IP address: 68.185.68.119

From: Robert Reader
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 9:08 PM
Subject: deregulation

We ask you to postpone any vote on deregulation until the ramifications of such an act can be publicly discussed and debated.

Information in the U. S. is in great difficulty -- the proposed deregulation will add to the problem. Be cautious -- be wise -- our informed electorate deserves your careful consideration.

Mary S. Reader Rev. Dr. Robert D. Reader
4 Allerton Ave.
Middletown NY 10940

From: Robert Reader
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 9:22 PM
Subject: deregulation

We ask you to delay the deregulation legislation until many, varied voices can examine and evaluate the effects of it.

Our information sources are already diminished by corporate ownership and decision making. Do not make a very bad situation worse for our democratic republic which must be informed in order to make our voices known. To take away our news sources is not the purpose of the FCC.

Mary S. Reaader Rev. Dr. Robert D. Reader
4 Allerton Ave.
Middletown NY 10940

From: John Rook
To: James Assey, Alex French
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 9:26 PM
Subject: Radio Deregulation

Major Media Players Square Off on FCC Rule Change
Mon April 28, 2003 06:23 PM ET
By Bob Tourtellotte

LOS ANGELES (Reuters) - Independent television producers joined three federal officials on Monday in urging U.S. regulators to rethink and at least delay a June 2 vote on changing broadcasting rules until further studies can be done.

Two FCC commissioners, along with U.S. Congressman Xavier Becerra, all Democrats, argued that not enough information is available to make sound decisions on how deregulation of television and radio will affect U.S. citizens.

At a public forum held by the University of Southern California on media ownership, they warned that if rule changes were adopted in June, as is widely expected within broadcasting circles, the changes would be too difficult to go back and fix later.

"What's important is that there is a potential here to remake our entire media landscape," FCC Commissioner Michael Copps said. "Suppose for a moment we vote to significantly loosen or eliminate (the rules) ...? How do you put that genie back in the bottle? The simple answer is you won't, because you can't."

FCC Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein wondered, "What's the rush to make major changes, now?"

Becerra added that the drive for a June 2 vote by the FCC "seems like a runaway train."

FCC Chairman Michael Powell, a Republican, has set June 2 as the date the five FCC commissioners will likely vote on revising decades-old media ownership limits that have come under fire from a federal appeals court.

Powell has said he favors relaxing the rules a bit and is expected to be joined by his fellow Republicans colleagues.

The speeches by the Democrats brought applause from an audience of largely independent entertainment industry producers, executives and others who filled USC's large meeting room to near capacity.

The FCC has undertaken a broad review of broadcast rules that may culminate in changes to decades-old rules governing how many broadcast outlets may be owned in one city by one company and whether rules should be relaxed on whether stations in different markets can be owned by a single company.

Other such "cross-ownership" rules dealing with one company owning newspapers, radio and television in one or various markets, and with major TV networks owning local stations covering over 35 percent of the U.S. market or owning more than one broadcast network, too, are up for review.

The four major networks NBC, a unit of General Electric Co., The Walt Disney Co.'s ABC Viacom Inc.'s CBS and News Corp. Ltd.'s Fox support rule changes. They argue current regulations are anti-competitive and outdated when news and entertainment travel via airwaves, cable TV lines, satellite dishes and the Internet.

Opponents complain that relaxing the rules will put too much power in too few hands, and they worry that having information and entertainment controlled by only a few major companies will squelch independent voices in the industry.

Writer-producer William Blinn, whose TV credits include "Starsky and Hutch" and "Roots," noted a major movie will be released by a studio, then sold for TV to a network owned by the same company that owns the studio and later to a cable TV channel that, again, is owned by the same parent company.

"This circular, digestive food chain can be described in a lot of ways, but I don't think competition is one," Blinn said.

He said putting product control in the hands of too few industry voices, "tends to homogenize what is put out, because it homogenizes the creators."

From: juli dickey
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 9:26 PM
Subject: via Voice4Change.org

Dear Chairman Powell,

I can only say this, most respectfully: If further deregulation is such a great idea, why not let more people, i.e., the public, know about it and spend time giving feedback about it. If it is so wonderful they would all agree, don't you think? I just spent last Saturday in a public hearing chaired by Commissioner Adelstein and I must tell you it was wonderful to hear all the views expressed! Truly democracy in action! If you want a democracy, let we the people speak! After all, the airwaves belong to us!

Sincerely,

Juli Dickey

From: David EbonyAllen Barkley
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 9:43 PM
Subject: via Voice4Change.org

Dear Sir,

As a citizen of these great United States I demand that the FCC extend its June 2 deadline and release any proposed rule changes for Public Debate.

I am very unhappy with the one sided coverage of the War with Iraq. When I compare U.S. media coverage of the War with that of London, Israel, Russia, I'm embarrassed to say the I felt as though I lived in third world country with a government that didn't believe that people should think for themselves.

From: jkidder@email.unc.edu
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jadelste@fcc.go
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 10:33 PM
Subject: Media concentration

Dear FCC Commisioners Powell, Abernathy, Copps, Martin and Adelstein,

Having read an AP wire about Chairman Powell's statement regarding relaxation of broadcasting ownership rules made Monday, I felt compelled to comment.

"The public may get more and better news programming if federal regulations are changed to allow newspapers to own radio and television stations..." This is bald-faced propaganda that is belied by the merest sketch of a study of communications, or even a thumbnail history of the Telecommunications act. Not since the latter have I seen such a jingoistic roll-out presentation from your office, and as we know it benefitted corporations but hurt consumers' pocketbooks.

This rules change would allow news and entertainment media to be concentrated in the hands of a fewer and fewer editorial boards. The very tone of the AP story is symptomatic of the narrow range of viewpoint presented in the media currently (most news being cost-effectively assembled from press releases). Since most outlets have a (potential) monetary vestment in the result of this ruling, of course they will not broadcast a contrary viewpoint... Unless they are too small to compete with such corporate behemoths. On such a tipped playing field, most small organizations can't compete, leading to little dissent or alternative programming presented to the consumer.

As an American, I feel that this sell-out of public intellectual space is unpatriotic. Dissent is what this republic is built on, and to narrow the range of discourse is unconscienable and unAmerican.

I want to believe that your ilk aren't cynical profiteers who've somehow hijacked the government, but this sort of rollback makes it very difficult to retain such a faith.

For the sake of democracy and your honor as citizens and represetatives of the Uniteds States of America, I urge you to reconsider your support of this ruling. We need to build in more guarantees of all viewpoints being heard in the media. Please do not make this rules-change.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Kidder

From: William G. Dunn, Jr
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 10:42 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

William G. Dunn, Jr (billdunn@sbcglobal.net) writes:

Below is the copy of my email to M. Powell.. please review.
Any changes that ease the restrictions on ownership of media outlets in favor of media giants becoming more powerful is wrong. I think Rupert Murdoch is already too powerful in the media of this country.

Please vote to keep adequate & powerful restrictions on the media ownership.

I agree with Olympia Snowe and the others that urge you to open this up further for public debate prior to any proposed changes!

I read your response to their letters and quite frankly I find your logic flawed. It would be better to maintained current restrictions until the American Public can fully grasp what is at stake here.

There have way too many closed door decisions made in this administration. This has to stop!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.124.8.185
Remote IP address: 66.124.8.185

From: rizoron1@hotmail.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 10:49 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Risa Rolando
4534 Tierra Sol
Arcadia, California 91233

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer

From: Tracey Schilling
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 11:01 PM
Subject: via Voice4Change.org

Dear Commissioner Powell,

Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Sincerely,

Tracey A. Schilling

From: Hugh
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 11:08 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Issues

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules.

In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition to the official hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA, I strongly urge the FCC to hold additional hearings elsewhere around the nation to solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions. I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

I am my no means an ultra liberal and I am no fan of Big Government. However, it is clear that media deregulation has not worked. Even the biggest supporters of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 are now admitting this isn't what they had in mind.

Government's job is to foster free enterprise by guaranteeing a level playing field. Please understand I am not talking about any kind of guarantee of success for anyone. Free markets will always have winners and losers. And media audiences at large may not pick the kind of formats or publications that I'd like them to. That's life. But the free market system - as it applies to broadcast media in this country - has become so corrupted and distorted since 1996 that something must be done.

First, no more deregulation must occur - particularly in the area of ownership limits and concentration.

Second, Congress should take a close look at restoring some ownership limits. I have no problem with a company like News Corp. (although I can't stand them personally) owning AM-FM-TV and a newspaper in a major market like New York. I would probably also have no problem with a company being able to own 2 AMs and 2 FMs along with a TV station and a newspaper in a major market. But major markets only. Below a certain level (any suggestions?), it should be 1 AM, 1 FM and 1 TV station and no print cross-ownership - at least not without a waiver from the FCC after the individual situation has been examined.

And total media ownership by a single company shouldn't be allowed to cover more than 33% of the country. I'm open to suggestions on how much any over-the-air media company should be allowed to expand into cable.

And - oh yes - any company threatening to bar airplay of recordings by a particular artist unless that artist promotes his or her concerns through them should be brought up on Federal charges - with jail terms in the offing.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Hugh

Hugh Christopher Henry
957 East 37th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11210-3431
USA

Home: 1-718-421-4288
Cell: 1-718-614-9463

CC: hch3@webtv.net

From: Hugh
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 11:08 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Issues

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules.

In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition to the official hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA, I strongly urge the FCC to hold additional hearings elsewhere around the nation to solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions. I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

I am my no means an ultra liberal and I am no fan of Big Government. However, it is clear that media deregulation has not worked. Even the biggest supporters of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 are now admitting this isn't what they had in mind.

Government's job is to foster free enterprise by guaranteeing a level playing field. Please understand I am not talking about any kind of guarantee of success for anyone. Free markets will always have winners and losers. And media audiences at large may not pick the kind of formats or publications that I'd like them to. That's life. But the free market system - as it applies to broadcast media in this country - has become so corrupted and distorted since 1996 that something must be done.

First, no more deregulation must occur - particularly in the area of ownership limits and concentration.